

REMARKS

These remarks and the accompanying amendments are responsive to the Office Action dated March 6, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as the "Office Action"). At the time of the last examination, Claims 5, 6, 13 and 25-30 were pending. By this amendment, Claims 13 and 25 are cancelled, and Claims 31 and 33 are new. Accordingly, upon entry of this amendment Claims 5, 6 and 26-33 will be pending for further examination. Of these claims, only claims 5, 6, 27 and 28 are independent. Reconsideration of the pending rejections is respectfully requested. in light of the amendments made herein and the following remarks.

Section 2 of the Office Action rejected Claims 5, 6, 13 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The rejection is moot with respect to cancelled Claims 13 and 25, but remains with respect to Claims 5, 6 and 26-28. Nevertheless, each of these remaining claims is amended to address the specific concerns specified in sections 3-5 of the Office Action. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection should be withdrawn.

Section 10 of the Office Action indicates that Claims 5, 6, 27 and 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection, and if rewritten in independent form, including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Claims 5, 6, 27 and 28 have each been so amended. Accordingly, Claims 5, 6, 27 and 28 are now in allowable form.

Section 7 of the Office Action rejected Claims 13, 25 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States patent number 6,181,944 issued to Uebayashi et al. (hereinafter "Uebayashi") in view of United States patent number 5,842,128 issued to Kito et al. (hereinafter "Kito"). Claims 13 and 25 are cancelled by this amendment, thereby rendering this

rejection moot with respect to Claims 13 and 25. Nevertheless, the rejection remains with respect to Claim 29. However, Claim 29 has also been amended hereinwith to depend from Claim 5, which is allowable for at least the reasons provided herein. Therefore, Claim 29 is likewise allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 5 is allowable.

Section 8 of the Office Action rejects Claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uebayashi, in view of Kito, and further in view of United States patent number 6,519,248 issued to Malko et al. However, Claim 26 has also been amended hereinwith to depend from Claim 5, which is allowable for at least the reasons provided herein. Therefore, Claim 26 is likewise allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 5 is allowable.

Section 9 of the Office Action rejects Claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uebayashi, in view of Kito, and further in view of United States patent number 6,463,273 issued to Day et al. However, Claim 30 depends from Claim 29, which now depends from Claim 5. Therefore, Claim 30 is likewise allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 5 is allowable.

New Claims 31-33 depend from Claim 6, which is now in allowable form. Therefore, Claims 31-33 are likewise allowable.

Accordingly, favorable action is respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 2nd day of June, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

WORKMAN NYDEGGER



ADRIAN J. LEE

Registration No. 42,785

Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 022913

AJL:ahy
DS0000005772V001